Case 1:20-cr-00238-JLT-SKO Document 1249 Filed 08/13/24 Page 1 of 3

JAMES S. THOMSON 1 California SBN 79658 Attorney and Counselor at Law 732 Addison Street, Suite A 3 Berkeley, California 94710 Telephone: (510) 525-9123 Facsimile: (510) 525-9124 4 Email: james@ycbtal.net 5 TIMOTHY J. FOLEY California SBN 111558 6 Attorney at Law 7 1017 L Street, Number 348 Sacramento, California 95814 Telephone: (916) 599-3501 8 Email: tfoley9@earthlink.net 9 Attorneys for Defendant JUSTIN GRAY 10 11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 12 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 13 14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Case No. 1:20-cr-00238-JLT-SKO Plaintiff, REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO MOTION 15 FOR ORDER COMPELLING THE **GOVERNMENT TO DESIGNATE** 16 VS. EVIDENCE TO BE USED AT TRIAL 17 (MOTION, Doc. # 1123) JUSTIN GRAY, et al. 18 Date: September 4, 2024 Time:1:00 p.m. Defendants. Place: Courtroom 7, Hon. Sheila Oberto 19 Defendant Justin Gray, through counsel, has filed a motion for an order compelling 20 the government to designate the items of physical and documentary evidence it intends to 21 22 introduce at trial. Doc. # 1123. The government opposes the motion, arguing that "any 23 such order regarding scheduling of the trial matters will be issued by the District Court" and that such an order is "neither practicable nor required by Rule 16." Doc. # 1198. 24 25 Preliminarily, as recognized by the government, Doc. # 1198, 2, Mr. Gray notes that this motion was filed well before counsel for Kenneth Johnson filed a motion, 26 27 pending before Judge Thurston and currently set for hearing on August 26, requesting a trial schedule. Doc. # 1180. While there may be some potential overlap with the broader 28

Justin Gray's Reply to Opposition to Motion to Designate Evidence

Case 1:20-cr-00238-JLT-SKO Document 1249 Filed 08/13/24 Page 2 of 3

motion brought by the codefendant, Mr. Gray's request is for immediate disclosure and designation of evidence so that pretrial motions to suppress or exclude evidence can be brought in a timely fashion before trial, and is ripe for decision at this time.¹

This case is not a typical criminal case. Tens of thousands of pages of discovery, not to mention the extensive audio and video files, have been produced. The third superseding indictment (Doc. # 1098) charges eleven different defendants with thirteen separate counts alleged against different combinations of the defendants, including a racketeering (RICO) conspiracy charge, allegations of six murders in aid of racketeering, drug and firearm counts, forfeiture allegations, sentencing factors including additional criminal activities, an uncharged murder, three conspiracies to murder, plus a stabbing, an attempted arson, a robbery, a beating, episodes of drug distribution and firearm use, all occurring over a nine year period. Mr. Gray is only charged in two counts (two events that occurred at the same time), and large amounts of the material produced by the prosecution seem to be irrelevant to his charges, but sifting through this evidence is a daunting, enormous task.

Due process under the Constitution requires that a criminal defendant be given notice of the case the prosecution brings against him, and a reasonable time to review, investigate, and prepare a defense. "No better instrument has been devised for arriving at truth than to give a person in jeopardy of serious loss notice of the case against him and opportunity to meet it." *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Comm. v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 171-72 (1951)(Conc. opn. of Frankfurter, J.); see *Lankford v. Idaho*, 500 U.S. 110, 121-22 (1991). It appears that the government does not disagree with the need to advise the defendants of the evidence it intends to present, but is only resisting the need to produce this information now.

This motion is also properly brought before the Magistrate Judge. Local Rules 302(b)(1), 430.1(b).

Case 1:20-cr-00238-JLT-SKO Document 1249 Filed 08/13/24 Page 3 of 3

In light of the nature of this case, and for the reasons discussed in the motion and above, the requested order, accompanied with a reasonable date for compliance, should be issued. Dated: August 13, 2024 Respectfully submitted, /s/ James S. Thomson /s/ Timothy J. Foley JAMES J. THOMSON TIMOTHY J. FOLEY Attorneys for JUSTIN GRAY

Justin Gray's Reply to Opposition to Motion to Designate Evidence